

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 4-21 are pending and stand rejected. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and pass the application on to issuance.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS:** Claim 21 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §112:** Claims 5, 9, 13, 19, and 20 have been amended to correct errors related to lack of antecedent basis.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103:** Claims 1 and 4-21 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,623,527 issued to Hamzy in view of USPN 6,529,943 issued to Ohi.

Hamzy is directed to a method in which a web page requested by a client is intercepted and modified to include a control button for a network service. The modified web page is passed on to and displayed by the client. A user can then select the added control button to cause a specified action. See Hamzy, Abstract, Fig. 3, Col. 4, lines 33-65.

Ohi is directed to a system in which, before providing a service to a client, a server publishes part of its information and functionality to the client so that the client can create a request for a service based on the published information and so that the server can then safely execute the request. See Ohi, col. 3, lines 1-6.

**Claim 1** directed to a client configurable web based imaging page redirector system and recites the following elements:

1. at least one processor at a client programmed with client software for receiving content from an imaging source at an external web site, wherein the content

- includes a designator to take a processing action with respect to at least a portion of the content;
2. redirector software loaded in the client that is operable to use a programmatic interface to obtain information;
  3. the redirector software being operable to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information;
  4. the redirector software being operable to choose at least one destination reference-based on the information; and
  5. the redirector software being operable to automatically redirect the client to the at least one destination reference.

The Examiner contends that Hamzy teaches the elements 1, 3, 4, and 5. The Examiner admits that "Hamzy is silent with reference to redirector software loaded in the client that uses a programmatic interface to obtain information." For this deficiency, the Examiner Relies on Ohi.

More specifically, the Examiner asserts that Hamzi, col. 5, lines 9-67 teaches "redirector software being executed to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information." The relevance of the cited passage is suspect as it neither mentions nor suggests redirector software executed to access a programmatic interface to obtain information. To illustrate, the cited passage is reproduced as follows:

The printer services 113, typically a dedicated printer server for the network, renders the web page into a print job by means of a printer driver for the selected printer. A browser application, either at proxy server 111 or printer services 113, takes the pages and issues a series of graphics device calls to the graphics API layer part of the operating system. This layer translates the graphics device calls into a format understood by the printer driver, preferably a device independent format such as a Graphics Object Content Architecture metafile. Once rendered, the printer services spools the print job in a print spooler queue until the page can be printed by the printer for eventual retrieval by the user. These processes are well known to those skilled in the art and will not be discussed further.

This process outlined above is described in somewhat greater detail with reference to the flow diagram depicted in FIG. 3. In step 201,

the browser at the client issues an HTTP request for a Web page. In step 203, this request is intercepted and handled by the proxy server for the intranet or ISP. The proxy server makes the request to the appropriate Web server to retrieve the page. Then, the proxy server adds the HTML necessary for the browser to display the button within the modified page, step 205. This step may optionally include a parsing step to parse the HTML to locate a blank space in the page. The parsing step may also be used to determine the visual characteristics of the page. For example, the gif files of the page can be examined to determine what other buttons on the page look like, so that the print button may either conform with or stand out from the rest of the controls on the Web page. Alternatively, the proxy server can add a standard print button at the top or bottom of the page.

In addition to the HTML for the print button's appearance, the proxy server also inserts the HTML used when a button is selected by the user. The embedded HTML identifies the requested web page, the requesting client and the path to the print server which controls the requested printer. The print button may actually comprise several individual selections or push buttons, each for one of a plurality of printers which may be controlled by the same printer server or different print servers.

The word button is used herein to include any control from which a network service can be selected. The printers selected for presentation in the button pulldown can be dependent on the client's identifying information. For example, it would not be useful to allow a user to choose a printer located in a secure area to which he does not have access. Thus, the printers available for selection by one browser may differ from those available to another. Further, in the case of mobile computers, the selected printers may be changed according to the user's current location, i.e. the printers which are most accessible to the user would be available for selection. A set of user profiles, referred to by table lookup, can be used to select the printers included in the HTML. The user profiles contain lists of printers and their respective print servers, URLs and so forth. The user profiles can be organized into sets of home printers for a preferred set of printers for each user at his home location and a sets of printers based on the user's current location for mobile users.

Hamzi, col. 5, lines 6-67. This passage merely mentions that a given intercepted web page can be modified to include a control button(s) for accessing specific network services selected according to a user profile. *See, e.g.,* Hamzi, Fig. 4B, numbers 333, 335, and 337 (reference numbers 336 and 337 are specified control buttons selected according to a user profile). In other words, when a web page is intercepted, a user

profile is accessed to determine one or more specified network services. HTML code for causing the display of control buttons for accessing those specified services is added to the web page which is ultimately passed on to a browser.

In stark contrast, Claim 1 recites "redirector software being operable to access the programmatic interface to obtain the information." The cited passage mentions nothing of redirector software capable of accessing a programmatic interface to obtain the information.

Furthermore, Hamzi (even when combined with Ohi) fails to teach or suggest redirector software that is operable (1) to choose at least one destination reference based on the information and (2) to automatically redirect the client to the at least one destination reference as recited by Claim 1.

The Examiner, citing Ohi col. 12, lines 52-61, steps S1301 and S1302, asserts that Ohi teaches "redirector software loaded in the client that is operable to use a programmatic interface to obtain information." That passage mentions nothing of redirector software. It merely describes a client obtaining a server API. That client does not use or include redirector software that uses a programmatic interface to obtain information. To the contrary, Ohi's client uses a graphical user interface generated by the server API to collect information. See, e.g., Ohi, col. 12, lines 53-56 and Fig. 4.


For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Hamzy as are Claims 4-14 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 1.

Claim 15 is directed to method implementation of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 15 and Claims 16-20 which depended from Claim 15.

Claim 21 is directed to a program product implementation of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 21.

**CONCLUSION:** Claims 1 and 4-21 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shell S. Simpson

By   
Jack H. McKinney  
Reg. No. 45,685

November 9, 2005